Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/837,007	LIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
David A. Zarneke	2891	

	David A. Zarneke	2891		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 6/25/09 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the strength in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	sideration and/or search (see NOT /);	ΓE below);		
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a α				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).	
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (Fig. 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
	/David A. Zarneke/			
	Primary Examiner, Art U 7/17/09	nit 2891		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Two arguments were presented with respect to the rejection of the claims.

The first argument is that it is not obvious to use the Ti- and Ni-containing layers of Farnworth in the invention of Nozawa because Farnworth doesn't teach a cylinder surrounded by a resin.

Please note that this is a piecemeal analysis of the rejection that considers the references individually as opposed to as a combination of references. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Nozawa is relied upon to teach the cylinder surrounded by a resin and Farnworth is relied upon to teach the fact that the use of Ti- and Ni-containing layers is known in the art.

The second argument is that Nozawa doesn't require an underfill because of the polymer layer that surrounds the cylinder.

Please note that an underfill is used to protect the bumps from damage as well as provide support, therefore an underfill would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.